

### ***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1-4, 7, 9-13, 16, 18-22, and 25, 27-29, and 34-41 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 29, and 41 being the independent claims. Claims 9, 18, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27, 34, and 41 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

### ***Comments on Substance of Interview***

Applicants thank the Examiner for courtesies extended to Applicants' representatives Michael Q. Lee (Reg. No. 35,239) and Omar Amin (Reg. No. 60,885) during the telephonic interview on July 15, 2010. Applicants' representatives discussed differences between the applied references and claim 1. Agreement was not reached, although the Examiner indicated that the prior art rejection of claim 1 (and similar rejections) may have been overcome, subject to further review. The subject matter of the discussion with the Examiner is further incorporated into the remarks below.

### ***Objection to Information Disclosure Statement***

The Examiner objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 1 March 2010 because the publication date of reference NPL1 allegedly was not disclosed.

Applicants request that the Examiner assume that reference NPL1 was published more than a year before the filing date (i.e., assume that it qualifies under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)).

***Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph***

Claim 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application, as filed, provides support for the features of claim 41. For example, pages 36-38 and FIG. 2F3 of the instant application, as filed, provide support for the features of claim 41 according to a non-limiting embodiment. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph***

Claims 9, 18, 27, 34, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as allegedly being indefinite. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the rejection, Applicants have amended claims 9, 18, 27, 34, and 41. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 9, 18, 27, 34, and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-3, 7, 10-12, 16, 19-21, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,925,595 to Whitedge *et al.* (“Whitedge”) in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,671,853 to Burkett *et al.* (“Burkett”). Claims 4, 13, and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitedge in further view of Burkett in further view of U.S. Patent

No. 6,665,709 to Barron ("Barron"). Claims 9, 18, 27, 34-36, and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitledge in further view of Burkett in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,754,670 to Lindsay *et al.* ("Lindsay") in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,092,079 to Gerald *et al.* ("Gerald"). Claims 28 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitledge in further view of Barron in further view of Burkett in further view of Lindsay in further view of Gerald. Claim 37 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Whitledge in further view of Burkett in further view of Lindsay in further view of Gerald in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,309,424 to Fallon ("Fallon"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and the Response to the Arguments presented on pages 17-25.

**i. The Exemplary Distinguishing Features of the Independent Claims**

Independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 29, and 41 recite features that distinguish over the applied references. For example, independent claim 1 recites generating a document table for a document, inputting the document table and the document into a content stream, and transmitting the content stream to a device. The document table includes object pointers corresponding to objects that make up the document. Each of the object pointers includes an attribute pointer that points to an object of the document in the content stream. The receiving device uses an attribute pointer to selectively access and copy an object from the content stream.

In other words, claim 1, among its other features, recites generating a document table having attribute pointers (included in the object pointers) that a receiving device

Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2010


uses to access a specific object in a content stream. Through use of an attribute pointer, the receiving device can access and edit a portion of the document, without having to write the entire document into writeable memory. Such operation is a great advantage, as writeable memory is a limited resource on many computing devices, such as mobile devices.

Independent claims 10, 19, 28, 29, and 41 recite similar exemplary distinguishing features as independent claim 1.

**ii. Whitledge Does not Disclose the Exemplary Distinguishing Features of the Independent Claims**

Whitledge describes methods and systems for content conversion of electronic data using data mining. See, Whitledge, Abstract. FIGS. 1 and 2 of Whitledge generally illustrate the operation of methods and systems of Whitledge. FIG. 1 of Whitledge is reproduced below.

**FIG. 1**



According to method 22 shown in FIG. 2 of Whitledge, content converter 16 receives, via proxy server 14, a request for an original electronic document from first

Reply to Office Action of March 26, 2010

device 12. Content converter 16 then consults database 18 to obtain conversion preferences for device 12. Content converter 16 returns the request to proxy server 14. Next, proxy server requests the original document from network 20 and sends the original document to content converter 16. Content converter 16 then converts the original document into a converted electronic document based on conversion preferences and sends this document to first device 12 via proxy server 14. See, Whitledge, Col. 8, lines 1-36.

Whitledge also describes generating a document to be sent to a device (e.g., first device 12) using data mining. Here, a network device (e.g., content converter 16) receives a first hypertext document from a network (e.g., network 20). The network device then creates a document object model of the first hypertext document and extracts selected elements from the first hypertext document based on, e.g., user preferences. References to the selected elements can be saved in a symbol table. The selected hypertext elements then are converted using data mining operations to create a second hypertext electronic document. The second hypertext document is in an appropriate format so that the receiving device (e.g., device 12) can display it. See, Whitledge, Col. 24, line 17 - Col. 25, line 2 and FIG. 9. FIG. 12 shows a block diagram illustrating this data mining method. See, Whitledge, Col. 25, lines 51-67.

On pages 7, 8, and 23-25 of the Office Action, the Examiner attempted to map the prior art to the exemplary distinguishing features of the independent claims. Specifically, on these pages of the Office Action, the Examiner attempted to map the prior art to the features of the receiving device receiving a content stream including a document and a document table, and the receiving device using an attribute pointer

included in the document table to selectively access and copy an object of the document into writeable memory. The Examiner relied solely on Whitledge to teach or suggest these features. In particular, the Examiner alleged that, in Whitledge, references saved into a symbol table teach or suggest pointers to objects (i.e., the attribute pointers recited in the independent claims). Furthermore, the Examiner alleged that extracting the selected hypertext elements teaches or suggests the receiving device copying an object in the content stream.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's allegations. In particular, the extracting of the selected elements does not teach or suggest the receiving device copying an object from a content stream because *the extracting occurs at the transmitting device (e.g., content converter 16) not at the receiving device as is claimed.*

Furthermore, references saved to the symbol table do not teach or suggest a document table including attribute pointers at least because these references are not used to selectively access portions of a document. For example, the extracting step of Whitledge does not use the references saved in the symbol table to access portions of a document as is claimed. Rather, the extracting of Whitledge is done using "one or more data mining expressions." See, Whitledge, Col. 24, lines 33-34.

In short, the independent claims recite features in which *a receiving device uses pointers included in a received document table* to access and copy portions of a received document. In contrast, Whitledge describes extracting elements from a document *using data mining expressions at the transmitting device*. Therefore, Whitledge does not teach or suggest the exemplary distinguishing features of independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 29, and 41.

Moreover, Burkett, Barron, Lindsay, Gerald, and Fallon do not cure the deficiencies of Whitledge. For example, Burkett does not provide the teachings missing from Whitledge. In various places in the Office Action, the Examiner used Burkett to teach or suggest inputting a document and a document table into a content stream<sup>1</sup>. The Examiner did not, however, rely on Burkett to teach or suggest the above-noted distinguishing features of the independent claims (as described above, the Examiner relied on Whitledge to allegedly teach or suggest those features), nor does Burkett teach or suggest those features.

Thus, independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 29, and 41 are patentable over the applied references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of independent claims 1, 10, 19, 28, 29, and 41 and their respective dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicants do not concede that Burkett teaches or suggests inputting a document and a document table into a content stream.


***Conclusion***

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Michael Q. Lee  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 35,239

Date: 7/24/2010

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600